

Mr. Speaker, take note: the birth of this new city is a landmark day for my district. I am confident that great things will come from their residents and their leaders. What a privilege it is for me to represent a constituency so involved and passionate about their destiny and that of our State and great Nation. Freedom rings in Sandy Springs.

COMMENTS OF KARL ROVE

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in light of Karl Rove's savage attack on the patriotism of liberals in this country, I have a couple of questions. Two days after 9/11, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I, on a bipartisan basis, pushed a \$20 billion package through this House in response to the attack. We had to sit in the Speaker's office and defend the President's request against people like Phil Graham and Don Nichols of the President's own party. Are those the liberals that Karl Rove was talking about?

One month after 9/11, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I went to the White House and urged the President to support a greatly increased homeland security budget. The President, without even looking at what we were proposing, said, "If you add one dime to our budget for homeland security, I will veto the bill." Mr. Rove was sitting over his shoulder when President Bush made that remark. Is President Bush one of those out-of-line liberals that Mr. Rove is talking about?

I come from the State of Wisconsin. I know a third-rate Joe McCarthy when I see one, and I saw one in Mr. Rove's comments yesterday.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this week I organized a subcommittee visit to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to help our Members learn about efforts to support the DHS mission to prevent bioattacks. We were briefed on aerosolized anthrax and botulinum toxin, among other things, and also the horrible things that terrorists could do with these deadly pathogens.

While the CDC is focusing on how our enemies could attack us, our military is focused on who may attack us. Among those who would attack are those held at Guantanamo Bay. These detainees are a far cry from the innocent millions who lost their lives at the hands of Stalin, Hitler, and the Khmer Rouge. These are terrorists who would put the botulinum toxin I saw on Monday in the food our families eat. If we had specific information this bio-weapon was about to be used in one of

our towns or cities, we would not hesitate to question and detain those we believed had information on such a plot. And that is exactly how we must always act because we are certain there are enemies out there that mean us grave harm. The American people expect us to be uncompromising in our mission to ensure the security of our citizens.

PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I do not know what it is about the Republicans, but despite overwhelming opposition by the American people across the board against the privatization of Social Security, they bring out yet another plan to privatize Social Security. They bring out another plan to privatize Social Security, to raid the Social Security trust fund, and to undermine the solvency of Social Security.

Three points to their plan. Undermine the solvency of Social Security; raid what is left of the Social Security trust fund; and to privatize Social Security, all of which the American public overwhelmingly disagrees with and has disagreed with whether it is presented by the President or by the Republicans in Congress.

A Republican got up here a few minutes ago and said we want to do this because these people can spend their money better than the government. I would remind that young woman that she is the government. The Republicans control the White House, the House and the Senate. And since they have controlled those three bodies, they have taken \$700 billion out of the Social Security trust fund; \$700 billion they have raided to date, and now they want to close the deal and take the rest of the money out of the Social Security trust fund.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 3010, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3010.

□ 0918

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. PUTNAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 23, 2005, the amendment by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 69, line 19.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have been concerned about a program known as Youth Build, which I know many Members are familiar with, which is a very good program which gets young people in urban areas and elsewhere to learn how to build houses. And the results are some very nice houses for deserving people, and an improvement of a neighborhood, and most importantly, skills for these young people.

Now, we ran into a little difficulty. It is not one of the more expensive of our programs although it has been, at \$60 million, not nothing. The President in his budget proposed I think \$50 million for it, but proposed that instead of being funded out of the HUD budget it be transferred to the Labor Department's budget. That led to, I guess, it falling between the cracks of the two appropriate subcommittees; so that while I understand there is support for the program and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), a former chairman of the HUD subcommittee, tells me that he strongly supports it, and I understand there was a very close vote in the Appropriations Committee on an amendment to put it back into the bill, both bills now come to the floor without that appropriation for Youth Build. And I think this is a case of something not being rejected on the merits, or not being something we cannot afford, but something that has sort of fallen through the cracks because of this proposed change in where it goes.

So I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee, given the, I believe, support, it was in the President's budget, there was virtually a tie vote in the Appropriations Committee, could the gentleman tell me, is there some hope